

PATENT

REMARKS

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, 17-20, 22-25, 27-31, and 33 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 2-5, 7, 10, 12-15, 17, 20, 22-25, 27 and 30 have been amended, and claims 1, 11, and 21 have been canceled without prejudice.

Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-25, 27-31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., (herein referred to as "Kim") in view of Thyagarajan et al., (hereinafter referred to as "Thyagarajan").

Section 706.02(j) provides that, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine the reference teaching. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Section 706.02(j), further provides that, "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references."

Claims 8, 18, 28, 31 and 33, among other elements claim "*weighting column m-1 25%; weighting column m 50%; and weighting column m+1 25%*" as part of filtering each element. Examiner states that this element is not disclosed in Kim reference and utilizes Thyagarajan reference to provide a 103(a) rejection. In order to support the conclusion, the Examiner relies on disclosure of column 7 and 8 of the Thyagarajan reference. Column 7 and 8 of the Thyagarajan reference discusses a DCT/DQT process, which is also disclosed in the pending application. However, the Thyagarajan reference does not disclose or suggest a selective filtering as claimed in 8, 18, 28, 31 and 33 claims. As stated in pending application at paragraph [0050], the selective filtering may occur after the DCT/DQT process. Therefore, the DCT/DQT process is not the

PATENT

same as the filtering technique claimed in the invention. Thus, examiner has not presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why an artisan would have found the "filtering" to have been obvious in light of the teaching of the DCT/DQT process. Furthermore, the Thyagarajan reference does not teach or suggest the filtering element as claimed in claims 8, 18, 28, 31 and 33. Therefore, the applicant believes the 103(a) rejection is not proper and requests the allowance of the claims. Otherwise, respectfully requests the Examiner to provide a convincing line of reasoning and non-final office action providing clarification.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 10 now depend from allowable claim 8, dependent claims 12, 13, 14, 15, 17 and 20 now depend from allowable claim 18, and dependent claims 22, 23, 24, 25, 27 and 30 now depend from allowable claim 28. Also, dependent claims 9 and 10 continue to depend from allowable claim 8, dependent claims 19 continue to depend from allowable claim 18, and dependent claims 29 continue to depend from allowable claim 28. Thus the dependent claims are also believed to be in condition of allowance and applicant respectfully request allowance of the claims.